

As a complete proof of this they found some tablets in which the oath was taken in the name of Nabonidus and Belshazzar. Oaths were never taken in Babylon, except in the name of God or of a reigning king. This shows that Nabonidus associated Belshazzar with him as king, or you may say co-king. The two were kings; Belshazzar had the actual direction of the government and army.

In most wars people pick out somebody on the other side as an individual to incarnate and represent everything you're against! They give their people the idea, if we could only get rid of that individual that ends it. I remember hearing Hitler speak on the radio when he was having his first big attack Czechoslovakia. He said this is a struggle between ~~two men~~ two men-- Benes President of Czechoslovakia and Hitler here. He put it up as two men. Of course it wasn't altogether. Benes wasn't anywhere as near as strong a force in Czechoslovakia as Hitler was in Germany at that time. But it is a tendency.

I remember during the first World War, everybody talked as if the Kaiser was the incarnation of evil, and if you could only get rid of the Kaiser everything would be alright. Actually I think the Kaiser was only the head of a system, and it was more the system than the man we were dealing with in that particular war.

But it would seem likely that the Persians chose Belshazzar, the actual ruler, instead of Nabonidus, the head ruler who was living in retirement as the one to -- against whom to direct their vilification! When the war ended in their inscription they did their best to forget that Belshazzar had ever existed. So in the accounts of the war in some subsequent years, all that we have of the ancient history except for Daniel, up to the time of Josephus whose history written c. 80 AAD. was based on the OT, up to that time, we have no mention of Belshazzar in any history that has been preserved to ~~any~~ date, except for the book of Daniel.

Prof. Dougherty says in his book, In view of the facts we find we must say Daniel is far superior to any other ancient work of his ory that we have in these three regards: 1) He recognized the name Belshazzar and preserved it 2) he preserves the fact that Belshazzar was the actual ruler, 3) he preserves the fact that Belshazzar was actually the co-king, rather than a first, that there was a dual rulership in the kingdom because in 3 vv. which I read to you, Belshazzar says I will make him the third ruler in the kgdm. Here he says he made him the third ruler in the kgdm. What does that mean? We did not know. We had no explanation anywhere until Prof. Dougherty found these facts.'

Here was a hint in the Bible of an historical fact. The Bible was not written to teach us history, to teach us geology, to teach us science. It's written to tell us about God, about our sin and how we can be reconciled to Him. But when it touches on these facts it touches on them correctly, thus we get many vital hints, and here is a very interesting hint about the dual rulership in the kgdm. at the time. To me it is one of the most striking evidences not only that the book of Daniel is accurate, but there is nothing else that has been preserved that could possibly have given a man living 400 yrs. later the information on which to write the correct account.